- 8 -

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 18. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,438,657 to Nakatani (Nakatani), in view of US Patent: 7,197,702 to Niyogi et al (Niyogi), and further view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), claims 3, 12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatani in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), claims 3, 12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatani in view of US Patent No. 6,778,703 to Zlotnick (Zlotnick), claims 3, 12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatani in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), and further in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), and further in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), and further in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 7,272,258 to Berkner et al (Berkner), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,778,703 to Zlotnick (Zlotnick), and Claims 8, 17, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatani in view of Niyogi in view of US Patent No. 6,519,617 Wanderski et al (Wanderski).

Nakatani, Berkner, Zlotnick, Niyogi, and Wanderski, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, "an identification system configured to identify a designated output system . . . wherein the mutation system determines which of the one or more mutators to apply based on one or more characteristics of the designated output system" as recited in claim 1, "an identification system configured to identify a designated output system . . . wherein the applying further comprises determines which of the one or more mutators to apply based on one or more characteristics of the designated output system . . . wherein the applying further comprises determines which of the one or more mutators to apply based on one or more characteristics of the designated output system" as recited in claim 9, or "identifying a designated output system . . . wherein the applying further comprises determines which of the one or more mutators to apply based on one or more characteristics of the designated output system . . . wherein the applying

The Office has asserted Nakatani teaches identifying an output system at column 18, lines 29-35, (Applicants assume the Office meant lines 25-32) which states:

> As described above, in the document layout conversion processing, the interim form document created in the work area 31 by the document arrangement conversion processing is output to the document storage area 28 in accordance

with the learned document layout information table (table 3) in the document layout information learning area 29.

However as noted in this section above and elsewhere in Nakatani, there is not teaching or suggestion of identifying a designated output system and then determining which of the one or more mutators to apply based on one or more characteristics of the designated output system. Similarly, none of the other cited references teach or suggest these limitations.

In sharp contrast as set forth in paragraphs [0024] and [0025] in the aboveidentified patent application:

> [0024] Referring back to FIG. 2, in step 108 <u>the document</u> processing system 12 identifies the device, such as printer 14 or printer 16, on which the original document is to be displayed. The document processing system 12 identifies the device based on instructions received from an operator using user input device 22 requesting a particular device to display the original document, although other ways of identifying the display device can be used, such as a programmed selection in the memory storage device 20 of document processing system 12 to use a particular printer 14 or 16 for a print job. <u>As part of the identification process, the document</u> processing system 12 obtains information from memory storage <u>device 20 about the characteristics of the device</u>, although other ways of obtaining information about the characteristics of the device can be used, such as an inquiry by the document processing system 12 to the device, such as printer 14 or 16, for the information.

[0025] In step 110, the document processing system 12 determines which of the one or more mutators obtained from the identified, stored document to use on the selected portion of the original document. The document processing system 12 determines which of the mutators to use based on the characteristics of the device on which the original document is going to be displayed and based on one or more elements of the original document, although other manners for determining which of the mutators to select can be used. For example, if the printer 14 selected for the printing job is a blackand-white printer, then a mutator for altering color obtained from the identified, stored document is irrelevant and would not used by the document processing system 12. In another example, the document processing system 12 could have lists of mutators stored in memory 20 which are associated with particular types of documents, such as for text documents, documents with text and images, and documents with images, and then the document processing system 12 would determine to use the obtained mutators that were on appropriate stored list for the type of document that matches the portion of the original document or the original document. (Emphasis added)

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 18. Since claims 2-9 and 27 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 10-17 and 28 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 9, and claims 19-26 and 29 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 18, they are distinguishable over the cited references and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 9, and 18.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2010

/Gunnar G. Leinberg/ Gunnar G. Leinberg Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP 1100 Clinton Square Rochester, New York 14604 Telephone: (585) 263-1014 Facsimile: (585) 263-1600